

| New Mexico - (Roy Field Office)  |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| FY 2005 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Grazing Lands   |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
| Applicant: _____   |  | Farm No. _____                           |  | Tract No. _____                     |  | CMS Field No's. _____ |  | Date: _____             |  |
| Tribal Land _____  |  | Non-Tribal Land _____                    |  | Preliminary Rating ____             |  | Final Rating ____     |  |                         |  |
| <b>1. Plants - Potential Points (250)</b>  |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
| Note: Instructions on separate sheet   |  | % Area in Contract Before Treatment      |  | % Area in Contract After Treatment. |  | Potential Points      |  | Points - Bench Mark     |  |
| Rangelands:  |  | SI of 76-1 00 w/trend up or not apparent |  | %                                   |  | 250                   |  |                         |  |
| Ecological   |  | SI of 51-75 with upward trend            |  | %                                   |  | 150                   |  |                         |  |
| Site   |  | SI of 51-75 with downward trend          |  | %                                   |  | 0                     |  |                         |  |
| Similarity   |  | SI of 26-50 with upward trend            |  | %                                   |  | 100                   |  |                         |  |
| Index  |  | SI of 26-50 with downward trend          |  | %                                   |  | 0                     |  |                         |  |
| (SI)*  |  | SI of 0-25 with upward trend             |  | %                                   |  | 50                    |  |                         |  |
|  |  | SI of 0-25 with downward trend           |  | %                                   |  | 0                     |  |                         |  |
| Riparian   |  | Use Attachment 1, 2, or 3                |  | %                                   |  | N/A                   |  |                         |  |
| Grazed Forest:   |  | Use Attachment 4                         |  | %                                   |  | N/A                   |  |                         |  |
|  |  | 1. Plants Total                          |  | 100%                                |  | Total:                |  |                         |  |
| <b>2. Conservation Practice(s) Selection - Potential Points (600)</b>  |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
| Any practice used in the ranking criteria and intended to be included in the EQIP Contract must be a cost-shared practice or have an incentive payment. Higher priority (value) should be given to those practices which address multiple resource concerns, are cost effective, and have long life spans. |  |  |  |                                     |  | Potential Points      |  | Percent of area Treated |  |
| Soil (Erosion) (Sheet & Rill, Wind & Water)Water(Quantity & Quality) (Excessive Runoff & Flooding) Plant (Community) (Productivity, Health & Vigor, Invasive Plants) Animals (Habitat) (Wildlife Imbalance, Domestic Animal Inadequate Quantities & Quality of Forage, Inadequate Stock Water)             |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
| All structural practices are in place and grazing plan being implemented.  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 130                   |  |                         |  |
| Range Planting (550)   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 70                    |  |                         |  |
| Water Development to improve grazing Management one Pasture (642, 614, 516)  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 60                    |  |                         |  |
| Water Development to improve Grazing Management two Pastures (642, 614, 516)   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 80                    |  |                         |  |
| Water Development to improve Grazing Management three Pastures (642, 614, 516)   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 100                   |  |                         |  |
| Water Development to improve Grazing Management four Pastures (642, 614, 516)  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 120                   |  |                         |  |
| Brush Management (314) Light   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 30                    |  |                         |  |
| Brush Management (314) Medium  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 40                    |  |                         |  |
| Brush Management (314) Heavy   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 120                   |  |                         |  |
| Continuous Grazing   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 0                     |  |                         |  |
| Initiate Prescribed Grazing (528A) -Deferred 25- 70% During Growing Season   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 50                    |  |                         |  |
| Initiate Prescribed Grazing (528A) - Deferred > 70% During The Growing Season  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 100                   |  |                         |  |
| Wildlife Watering Facility (648)   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 30                    |  |                         |  |
| Prescribed Burning (338)   |  |  |  |                                     |  | 30                    |  |                         |  |
| <b>2. Conservation Practice Selection</b>  |  |  |  |                                     |  | Total:                |  |                         |  |
| <b>3. Other Considerations - Potential Points (150)</b>  |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
| Below are some suggested, not required, criteria. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to recommend based on LWG advice, please include them here.   |  |  |  |                                     |  | Potential Points      |  | Bench-mark              |  |
| A. At risk species are in the area and the contract will enhance habitat for the species.  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 75                    |  | 0                       |  |
| B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.  |  |  |  |                                     |  | N/A                   |  | 0                       |  |
| C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active/planned sec. 319 project   |  |  |  |                                     |  | N/A                   |  | 0                       |  |
| D. This land is within a NMED Category I watershed.  |  |  |  |                                     |  | N/A                   |  | 0                       |  |
| E. Producer has a developed EQIP plan to meet a RMS on or before January 28, 2005  |  |  |  |                                     |  | 75                    |  | 0                       |  |
|  |  |  |  |                                     |  | Total:                |  | 0                       |  |
| A minimum of 300 hundred points must be earned to be considered for ranking  |  |  |  |                                     |  |                       |  |                         |  |
| Designated Conservationist   |  |  |  |                                     |  | Date                  |  |                         |  |